

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Christopher P. VIENS  
Serial Number: 10/736,131  
Filed: 12/15/2003  
Attorney Docket No: P 03-12  
Group Art Unit No: 3635  
Examiner: Elizabeth A. PLUMMER

For: INSULATED CEILING HATCH

Lebanon, New Hampshire  
Electronically Filed on August 30, 2007

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, Virginia

S I R:

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

To fulfil the duty of Applicant to provide a written record containing the substance of an interview with the Examiner, as set forth in § 713.04 of the MPEP and 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and § 1.2, the following statement summarizing the telephonic interview of 07/30/07 has been prepared.

In preparation for a telephonic interview with the Examiner, Applicant's attorney submitted proposed language for claim 1 and remarks on the office action mailed 06/19/07; these materials were provided to the Examiner via facsimile on 07/20/07. The remarks pointed out why claims 1 and 2 were felt to be clearly allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant's attorney pointed out in his remarks that it was felt that the issue raised by the Examiner had been addressed in the earlier amendment, filed 04/06/07.

On 07/30/2007, Examiner Elizabeth A. Plummer called the IP Law Offices of Michael J. Weins and spoke with Applicant's representatives Michael J. Weins and Jeffrey E. Semprebon.

During this telephonic interview, the Examiner stated that she and her supervisor felt that claim 1 should be allowable if the element “insulating block” were changed to “block of insulation”. Applicant’s representatives felt that such change would be reasonable, and the Examiner stated that she would make the change by Examiner’s amendment and that a Notice of Allowance should be completed by the end of the week.

Applicant’s attorney called the Examiner on 08/08/07 to inquire as to the status of the application, as the Patent Office’s status website (PAIR) did not provide any indication as of that date that the application had been allowed. On 08/13/07, the Examiner called Applicant’s representatives to leave a message that a Notice of Allowance had been entered and the application forwarded to the contractor for mailing, and that the Notice should be received in due course. On 08/27/07, Applicant’s attorney again called to inquire as to status, since the Notice had not been received and the PAIR system still did not indicate any further action on the application as of that date. The Examiner again confirmed that the application had been allowed, and stated that the Notice of Allowance did appear on her status system.

Applicant’s representative would again like to thank the Examiner for granting the telephonic interview and for offering to enter the agreed-upon changes via Examiner’s amendment to expedite the allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Christopher P. Viens

By: **Michael J. Weins/**  
Michael J. Weins  
IP Law Offices of Michael J. Weins  
31 Bank Street  
Lebanon, NH 03766  
(603) 448-1922  
Reg. No. 28,485